



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**  
**Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

*My*

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/292,834    04/16/99    MORIGUCHI

K    P99.0653

026263    IM61/0205  
SONNENSCHN NATH & ROSENTHAL  
P.O. BOX 061080  
WACKER DRIVE STATION  
CHICAGO IL 60606-1080

EXAMINER
----------

HENDRICKSON, S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1754

DATE MAILED:

02/05/01

*10*

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

292834

Applicant(s)

Moriguchi

Examiner

Wendrickson

Group Art Unit

1754

—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address—

## Period for Response

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a response be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for response specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a response within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for response is specified above, such period shall, by default, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to respond within the set or extended period for response will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

## Status

- ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11/8/01.
- ☒ This action is **FINAL**.
- ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.
- Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.
- ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- ☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.
- ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.
- ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)

- ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
  - ☐ All ☐ Some\* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 1.7.2(a)).

\*Certified copies not received: \_\_\_\_\_

## Attachment(s)

- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413
- ☐ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948
- ☐ Other \_\_\_\_\_

Office Action Summary

Art Unit: 1754

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Tamaki et al. (EP 762,522).

Tamaki teaches on pages 4 and 5 a graphitized material containing 0.1% boron and having a d spacing of .336 or less. Although the surface area and between-closure structures are not recited, the material of Tamaki is deemed to possess them since the d spacing, which represents basic microstructure, is the same as claimed. Moreover, the reference teaches a process in which mesophase pitch is carbonized and milled, then contacted with a boron source and heated to graphitization temperatures to make an electrode for lithium batteries. As the process and utility is (essentially) the same, no differences in the product are seen. The examiner takes Official Notice that making powder is known to require pulverization. The process claims are sufficiently unclear to determine whether any differences in process steps actually exist.

Art Unit: 1754

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

- A) In claim 1, '100um' and the like is unclear- it appears that the division sign is necessary.
- B) In claims 1 and 6, 'condition of scraping' is unclear. Is a scraping step meant?
- C) In claim 4, the steps are unclear. To what is boron added?
- D) In claim 4, 'for graphitization' is unclear. Are these words unnecessary, or does applicant mean that the temperature is 1500 degrees *above the graphitization temperature*?
- E) In claim 5, the two heating steps appear redundant or contradictory. What is the order of steps? How many heating steps are there? Also, 'the ... carbon' is, strictly speaking, without antecedent basis.
- F) In claim 6, 'oxidizing' appears intended. In any event, 'the heat treatment' is unclear as to the antecedent. What does the claim require?
- G) In claim 4, 'elevated speed' is subjective and unclear. As compared to what?

Applicant's arguments filed 1/8/2001 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The reference appears to possess the claimed features for the reasons given; the PTO is not capable of running the experiments applicants desire to prove this.

Art Unit: 1754

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to examiner Hendrickson at telephone number (703) 308-2539.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Stuart Hendrickson', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Stuart Hendrickson  
examiner Art Unit 1754